



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,764	08/20/2003	Pu Zhou	1001.1688101	8049
28075	7590	02/23/2007	EXAMINER	
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC			KOHARSKI, CHRISTOPHER	
1221 NICOLLET AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 800			3763	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/645,764	ZHOU, PU
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher D. Koharski	3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-2,6-8,10,12,17 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-2,6-8,10,12,17 and 18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
_____.
_____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Amendment***

Examiner acknowledges the pre-appeal conference brief filed 10/12/2006, pursuant to the decision filed 01/03/2007, Examiner will re-open prosecution with a new non-final office action (see below). Currently claims 1-2, 6-8, 10, 12, 17 and 18 are pending for examination in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pre-appeal conference request, filed 10/12/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-2, 6-8, 10, 12, 17 and 18 under Chien et al. (5,891,114) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 3763

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-2, 8, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenholtz (6,203,534) in view of Cohen (5,330,521).

Regarding claims 1-2, 8, 10 and 12, Schoenholtz discloses a catheter (12) with a braided reinforcing layer (24) that is made from two or more continuous wires woven together made up of stainless steel (col 4, ln 10-35) (Figures 1-3) with a protective overcoat (42, 22) over this woven wire reinforcement. Schoenholtz meets the claim limitations as described above except for the distal and proximal braided section having a decreasing cross sectional area.

However, Cohen teaches an electrical lead including a wire core having a cross-sectional area, which differs over its length.

Regarding claims 1-2, 8, 10 and 12, Cohen teaches (Figure 4) an implantable tubular device that uses a wire-reinforcement coil (42) with a diameter that decreases along its length (d_L , d_S) along with various production methods (Figure 4, col 8, ln 60-70, col 9, ln 1-43).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to add the methods and reinforcement member teachings of Cohen to the system of Schoenholtz because as taught in Cohen the reduction of the core diameter of the reinforcement member allows for tip flexibility and tracking within a patient without overly compromising the tip strength. The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Cohen.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 6-7 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoenholtz (6,203,534) in view of Cohen (5,330,521).

Schoenholtz in view of Cohen meets the claim limitations as described above except for the specific portion wire diameters.

Regarding claims 6-7 and 17-18, Cohen teaches a specific wire transition diameter and also states that various other diameters may also be employed (col 9, ln 25-35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the system of Schoenholtz in view of Cohen with the wire core ranges as claimed by Applicant, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Koharski whose telephone number is 571-272-7230. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Date: 2/5/07


Christopher D. Koharski
AU 3763

